

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 2-21 are pending. Claim 1 has been canceled. No new matter has been added. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

### **Claim Status**

Claims 2-14 were allowed.

Claims 1, 15, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Johnston (US 5,673,333) in view of Barton (US 6,733,108).

Claims 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Johnston in view of Barton and Lin (US 2002/0080209).

### **The Allowable Subject Matter**

Independent claims 15 and 18 have been amended to include the indicated allowable subject matter. Added claim 21 substantially corresponds to reverse steps of claim 18 in that it recites "connecting" instead of "disconnecting".

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment places the application in condition for allowance. The amended claims avoid the rejections set forth in the last Office action because they recite the subject matter indicated allowable by the Office. The amended claims do not raise the issue of new matter because the subject matter therein has already been claimed and examined (and indicated allowable). The amendment also does not present additional claims, as claim 21 takes the place of canceled claim 1. Nor do the amended claims present new issues requiring further consideration or search, because the subject matter therein was previously claimed and examined. Furthermore, the claims have been amended as recommended by the Office. For these reasons Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance.

## The Rejections

Applicants respectfully continue to traverse the rejections. Nevertheless, the claims have been amended as suggested by the Office to advance prosecution. Applicants reserve the right to file another application (e.g., a divisional application) relating to any claim.

One skilled in the art would recognize that Barton's ink spittoon (40) is not structurally or functionally compatible with Johnston's sideways printing (70). Barton does not teach or suggest sideways operation of the ink spittoon (40). Conversely, Barton's ink spittoon (40) is designed to capture dropping ink (38). As a result, the ink spittoon (40) must be located vertically below a printhead (36). It would not have been obvious to locate Barton's ink spittoon (40) horizontally adjacent to Johnston's printer (70), as alleged by the Office. Nor is there any prior art evidence of record of an ink capturing vessel designed for sideways operation, especially in a cash dispensing automated banking machine. The Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

## Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance.

The undersigned is willing to discuss any aspect of the Application by telephone at the Office's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Ralph E. Jocke Reg. No. 31,029  
WALKER & JOCKE  
231 South Broadway  
Medina, Ohio 44256  
(330) 721-0000